



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

POPULATION OR PROSPERITY

ANNUAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT

FRANK A. FETTER

Princeton University

The humanitarian doctrine of population.

The question posed by Malthus refuses to be ignored. Again and again the nations are forced to give ear to it. The celebrated essay in 1798 marked the boundary between two eras of thought on this question. Before that a large and increasing population was generally favored; since that date it has never ceased to be looked upon by some with doubt and with fear.

The contrast between the two eras, however, is less in respect to the judgment of results than in respect to the criterion by which those results are to be measured. Before Malthus the criterion was the prosperity of the sovereign and of the ruling classes; thereafter it became the welfare of the increasing masses. Unwittingly, but none the less truly, Malthus set before the eyes of men a new picture of the humble unit of population. Instead of the man with the hoe, patient taxpayer and soldier of the king, frugal workman contributing with his teeming fellows to swell the rents of landlords and the profits of employers, Malthus helped the world to see the human individual, striving to maintain a family and to win the joys of life, but finding the very number of his fellows an obstacle in the way toward these ends. Before Malthus population was a question either of political or of commercial economy; with him it began to be a question of social economy.

These statements appear paradoxical when one recalls that the first purpose of Malthus was to dispel the illusory hopes of social perfection. His proposition that population has a fateful tendency to outstrip the production of food was used to condone the patent evils of existing society. His doctrine became the stock argument to discourage plans of social betterment. This may all be granted. Our purpose is not to praise Malthus but to appreciate him. In the perspective of more than a century neither the conscious purposes of men nor the immediate applications of their teachings are usually seen to have determined their real influence. Malthus had in some ways a narrow outlook, and his often confused thought gave false implications to the main

truth he brought to public attention. Yet he was a man of gentle spirit, far from harsh and unsympathetic. Approaching the question solely with the purpose of the student without political or commercial bias, he became the agent in advancing, if not in originating, the humanitarian and democratic treatment of the population problem. That problem is to determine the best proportion between the number of inhabitants and the area and resources of a land, judged with reference to the abiding welfare of the great mass of the people of the nation.

English population doctrine in the 19th century.

When Adam Smith wrote, he could cite many evidences of the rise of real wages during the course of the eighteenth century. Twenty-two years later Malthus wrote in a time of war, of near-famine, of increasing population, and of decreasing prosperity for the masses. The forty years that followed were a period of misery unequalled in modern times for the working classes of Britain. In this time in England the dominant opinion accepted the Malthusian doctrine as the explanation of what was happening, and derived from it conservative and pessimistic conclusions as to the popular welfare. Some social corollaries of the doctrine were however drawn by James Mill and other Radicals and were restated by J. S. Mill in his *Political Economy* in 1848. He showed the benefits to the laborers in the limitation of their numbers, whereas Malthus had never ceased to regard population as well-nigh fatalistically determined. By a turn of fate the circumstances of that very time largely robbed of practical interest Mill's views on the subject. Things had already taken a turn for the better. The worst evils of the factory system were in course of being remedied, the sanitation of cities was improving, the laborers were better organized, the rate of growth of population was slackening, and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 had prepared the way for the cheapening of the food of the people even in a period of rising wages following the gold discoveries. Coöperating with these influences, the improvement of transportation was opening up new sources of food supplies on virgin soils and making them available to the markets of western Europe. In the following half century the real wages and general welfare of the masses, alike in western Europe and in the United States, were to advance almost steadily. This whole movement was well under way when Mill was writing. In such a period as that, the

Malthusian doctrine in any version could not but appear to the practical eye to be either false or futile. It lost its usefulness as a conservative argument in support of existing institutions, for the best argument was the unmistakable progress of the masses. It lost its hostile character to the champions of radical change.

American views on population.

American views on population were from the first unfriendly to the Malthusian doctrine. It appeared in the earlier textbooks of English origin or written under English influence, and as a mere classroom abstraction it was given a small measure of curious attention. But in any of its forms it involved an opinion adverse to an unrestrained increase of population, whereas the conditions in America made such an idea appear false as theory and harmful in practice. A growing population was favorable to the interests alike of landowners, of active business men, of the rival sections, and of the national government. There resulted from this economic situation a peculiarly American optimism on the subject. Density of population as an influence favorable to the division of labor and to the economies of production in manufacture was looked upon as in itself an efficient cause in increasing the per capita income. One type of this optimism, exemplified by Henry George, denied on principle that population ever could increase too much. Another type, represented by Henry Carey, held that population in fact was not likely to increase too much in America. The national bias often led to crediting to American character all of the benefits resulting from exceptional natural resources combined with relative scarcity of population. This bias and this reasoning still survive among us today.

Rapid settlement of the United States.

Students of American economic conditions are familiar with the series of shaded charts in the Census volumes on population showing by decades the extension of the settled area since 1790 and its gradually increasing density. As one studies the earlier of these charts one can see how the blank spaces on the maps of that day must have aroused the imagination and the hopes of men. There lay whole empires of land almost untenanted and calling to be used. Decade by decade for a hundred years the frontier extended at a hardly slackening rate while the density increased on the settled area, until abruptly, about 1890, the process ended or changed

its nature. The chart for 1900 shows little alteration in its outline from that for a decade earlier. The increase of population in the decade had been thirteen millions, but of these, eight millions had been added to the urban and only five millions to the rural population. In the following decade, from 1900 to 1910, the increase was sixteen millions, of which twelve millions were added to the urban and but four millions to the rural population. Dividing our national history since 1790 into four periods, each of thirty years, it is seen that in the first the density per mile increased .7 of an inhabitant, in the second 2.4 inhabitants, in the third 9, and in the fourth 14. Thus the increase in the number per square mile has gone on at an accelerating rate, and was twenty times as fast in the last as in the first period. As an index of the demands which increasing population makes upon resources, these figures are more truly significant than are the absolute numbers of people or the percentage of increase by decades; for they show how many additional inhabitants must find employment, materials, and food on the available area. This means greater intensiveness of utilization. The cumulative additions are now made on an area nearing, or already past, the point of maximum advantage to the masses of the nation.

Disappearance of the frontier.

By 1890 the habitable agricultural area of the United States had not been completely occupied, but the frontier of fertile lands ready for man's use had at length been all but attained. Suddenly was unmasked the true character of those great, uncolored areas shown on the map. Deserts they are, for the most part, deserts they must ever remain. Nature had no more free gifts to distribute to the prodigal children of America. She would grant still some new arable fields, but only for the price of toil and patient art. Our increasing population must thenceforth find its livelihood in the more intensive cultivation of the settled areas. We had been rapidly losing those economic advantages which had distinguished us from the older, more densely settled countries. A new economic situation confronted our people.

Economic results did not long delay their appearance. In the nineties of the last century the wave of popular prosperity at length attained its crest. Some great forces lifting wages throughout Christendom despite any counteracting effects from increasing population seem at last to have spent themselves. Cheap food

from America had been a boon to the European workman as well as to the American. The year 1896 marked the lowest American prices in recent decades for food and for farm products. The year 1898 was that of maximum export of foodstuffs from the United States. Since 1896 food and other farm products have almost steadily advanced in price at a more rapid rate than general prices; since 1898 exports of foodstuffs from the United States have less steadily, but none the less surely, declined. In the past twenty years the general progress in science and the technical arts has been phenomenal. It is the accepted economic belief that the trend and effect of such changes is favorable to the real wages of labor. The last twenty years, therefore, should have been a period of rapidly rising wages had not this technical progress been offset by some powerful opposing forces. Why have real wages risen so slowly or even fallen? In part no doubt the explanation may be found in the fact that when the general scale of prices is rising wages move more tardily. In large part the explanation must be found in the fact that we have passed the point of diminishing returns in the relation of our population to our resources. The growth of population is serving to neutralize for the masses of the people the gains of technical progress. It is high time to revise the optimistic American doctrine of population.

Extravagant estimates of future population.

The public is accustomed to the estimates of enormous population possible on the present area of this country. These estimates express to many, perhaps to most Americans, not only the possible but also the inevitable and desirable increase. They ask: why should not an area almost equal to that of Europe support 400,000,000 instead of one fourth that number? We have little more than thirty inhabitants per square mile. France and Austria-Hungary have each a population over six times as dense, Switzerland eight times, Germany and Italy ten times, the Netherlands fifteen times, and Belgium twenty-two times. We have but to equal Italy to support a population of a billion. We have but to equal Belgium to support two and a quarter billions. But if we could conceivably support such a future population on the present area it would be in what manner, with what gain to civilization and at what cost to the popular welfare?

Take the German Empire as a standard of comparison. Despite the great material advances in Germany of late, the real wages of

the working people are much below those in America. Who would suggest that with the conditions of popular thought in America we could calmly contemplate the decline of wages and of the standard of living among us toward those of the German masses today?

The Swiss in their mountainous land with a population four fifths as dense as that of Germany are achieving quite as wonderful a result. Only a marvel of patient industry enables the Swiss to draw their livelihood from such an area. Watch the Swiss peasant at his work and you may understand. The cattle stand in the stable while the peasant cuts their food and brings it to them lest they may trample down the precious grass. Man's labor is less valuable there than are the uses of that little patch of land. In the haying season the harvester clings with one hand to the steep mountain side, cutting the grass by the handful and piling it in little bunches loaded down with stones to keep it from blowing away, until it can be carried down into the valley on the backs of men and women. That is what such a density of population means, translated into terms of human labor.

Shall Italy be our population-ideal? A recent well-known traveler¹ from America reports the ordinary food of the laborer in Sicily as consisting of "a piece of black bread and perhaps a bit of soup of green herbs of some kind or other." "For days or months the peasants live on almost any sort of green thing they find in the fields, frequently eating it raw just like the cattle."

Consequences of further rapid increase.

In the light of such facts, the flights of speculative statistics regarding the possible increase of our population evidence a forgetfulness of economic principles and a recklessness of economic consequences. To force production very fast or far on a given area entails some notable results. Cultivation must become in part more intensive, with hand labor, in part more expensive, with a larger investment in equipment on larger farms.

We have heard much of late the appeal, *Back to the land!* As a plan to be followed by masses of men with the hope of relieving the pressure of population it is vain. Every time one pair of hands is added to the agricultural population, three more mouths are added to the city population waiting to consume the products.

America has no exclusive knowledge of mechanical inventions and no exclusive claim to their use. They are internationally

¹ Booker T. Washington, in *The Man Farthest Down*, 1912.

patented and for sale. Whoever finds it profitable may use them. If they are used less in other countries it is because the work can be done more cheaply by hand under their conditions. The general level of the use of machinery is largely fixed by the relations between population and resources, and not by any mysterious racial talent for machinery. It is the density of population that mainly explains the contrast in this regard between the people of Europe on the one hand, and on the other those of the same races in America, Canada, and Australia.

Popular welfare in America is already threatened. To preserve the favorable relation of population to resources and to control in some measure the fate and fortunes of the children of this and future generations the two most important means possible are: conservation of national resources, and retarding the rate of increase of population.

Need of a conservation policy.

For the conservation movement, that sadly belated attempt to check national prodigality, let us speak only words of approval. But we must recognize its limitations. As to minerals, it only delays their inevitable, final exhaustion. At the present rate of increase of the use of our stores, iron ore will be exhausted in thirty years, petroleum in ninety years, and coal in one hundred fifty years. If, however, the population became stationary, the periods of possible use would be enormously extended. In the reclamation of soil by drainage and irrigation the outlook is that about 15 per cent may thus be added ultimately to the area in farms, representing at the most 40 per cent addition to the present food production by present methods. Even when all this has been accomplished at much cost it provides barely for two decades of increase of our population at the present rate, and by 1930 the national demand for food will again be in the same relation to the productive area that it now is.

The hope is ever with us that improvements in agricultural methods will offset the influence of the increase of population. We rightly speak of the wonders of the new agriculture; but these improvements fast crowding upon each other in the past two decades have not even kept the cost of food from increasing in terms of the common man's wage. Shall we then base an economic policy on the assumption of much greater improvements which as yet are only in the realm of imagination? Undoubtedly the de-

velopment of water power will retard the trend toward higher prices of coal; forestry will eventually grow lumber enough to meet the greatly curtailed demand at higher prices; but, given a population steadily increasing at anything like the present rate, and real wages in America must decrease in terms of food, clothing and fuel, and all the commodities dependent on wood, iron, copper, and other primary materials. The steady increase alone of population will offset the popular benefits of the new miracles of industrial progress.

Declining rate of natural increase.

The percentual rate of increase of population in the United States has shown a general downward trend since the Civil War. Before 1860 it had been steadily near 35 per cent each decade; between 1860 and 1890 it ranged between 30 and 23 per cent; and in each of the last two decades it has been about 21 per cent. This downward trend has been tardily following a declining birth rate. Race suicide, however, is very far from being an imminent peril for the nation as a whole. The real occasion for disquietude is that this phenomenon is so largely correlated with education and with eminent attainment. In many families the birth rate is much too high for the welfare of the parents, of the children, and of the community. Recent studies among city populations have demonstrated that as the number of births in a family passes a moderate limit the mortality increases inordinately.

Our population increased between 1900 and 1910 nearly sixteen million people. A much slower rate of growth would realize the common prediction of a quarter billion in another century, and a half billion in two centuries. So far as these figures are based on forecasts of "natural increase" (exclusive of immigration), they may prove to be largely overestimated. Changes in public opinion, in social standards, in the means of communication and of education, in industry, and in family relations, are in rapid progress. Affecting wider and wider circles, these influences promise to strengthen greatly the forces making for volitional control of population. The earlier applications of the doctrine of eugenics probably will be to control the increase of mental and of physical defectives. These forces, if not neutralized, will rapidly reduce the rate of increase.

The question of immigration.

In the decade ending 1910, but for immigration, the rate of increase of the total population would have been much less instead of somewhat greater than that of the preceding decade. But in 1910 there were over three million more foreign-born persons in the country than were here ten years earlier. One fifth of the increase in population consisted in foreign-born, and another fifth of their children born in America. In each of the six years preceding the census nearly a million immigrants arrived. All previous records were exceeded. The continuing possibilities of immigration as a source of contributions to our population in the future are enormous.² As migration is made easier by the spread of information and by the improvement of the means of travel, the lure of a higher wage becomes more and more effective. There is no limit to this motive, except the meager cost of steerage passage, until real wages in America are leveled down to those of the most impoverished populations permitted to enter our ports.

The current objections to immigration are mainly based on the alleged evil effects to the political, social, and moral standards of the community. It is often asserted that present immigration is inferior in racial quality to that of the past. Whatever be the truth and error mingled in these views, we are not now discussing them. Our view is wholly impersonal and without race prejudice. If the present immigration were all of the Anglo-Saxon race, were able to speak, read and write English, and had the same political sentiments and capacities as the earlier population, the validity of our present conclusions would be unaffected.

The open-door policy, then and now.

When our policy of unrestricted immigration is thus opposed to the interests of the mass of the people, its continuation in a democracy where universal manhood suffrage prevails, is possible only because of a remarkable complexity of ideas, sentiments, and interests, neutralizing each other and paralyzing action. The American sentiment in favor of the open door to the oppressed

² The assumption that immigration constitutes a net addition to the population is not in accord with the well known theory of Francis A. Walker. He believed that immigration had the effect of reducing the birth rate of the native born so greatly that the net increase was about what it would have been without immigration. Let it suffice to say that this view seems to be a misreading of the evidence and an exaggeration of a truth of limited application.

of all lands is a part of our national heritage. The wish to share with others the blessings of freedom and of economic plenty is the product of many generations of American experience. The open door policy had partly a political basis: a growing population in a young and sparsely settled country gave greater security on the frontier of settlement and greater strength against foreign enemies. The policy had, however, mainly an economic basis: land was here a free good on the margin of a vast frontier. Most citizens benefited by a growing population. Let it not be accounted cynicism to recognize in this national self-interest the source of a generous sentiment toward the incoming stranger. That sentiment, truly generous, now lingers after its real cause has disappeared. It impels to an unthinking liberality to the alien while sacrificing the heritage of the workers of America; it makes the citizen with humane ideals the misguided ally of commercial greed. The open door policy is vain to relieve the condition of the masses of other lands. Emigration from overcrowded countries, with the rarest exceptions, leaves no permanent gaps. Natural increase quickly fills the ranks of an impoverished peasantry. If America with futile hospitality continues to welcome great numbers from countries with low standards of living, she can but reduce the level of her own prosperity while affording no permanent relief to the overcrowded lands. Nations under bad governments must find relief through the reform of their own political conditions. Lands whose people are in economic misery must improve their own industrial organization, elevate their standards of living, and limit their numbers. If they go on breeding multitudes which find an unhindered outlet in continuous migration to more fortunate lands, they can at last but drag others down to their own unhappy economic level.

The pride of immigrants and of their children, sometimes to the second and third generations, is another strong force opposing restriction. Immigrants, having become citizens, are proud of the race of their origin, and resent restriction as a reflection upon themselves and their people. One may admire the loyalty and idealism here manifested, while regretting that these sentiments and arguments serve to distract attention from the real problem to minor and irrelevant incidents.

Public welfare or private profits.

A strong commercial motive operates in the most influential class of employers in favor of the continuance of immigration.

From the beginning of our history, proprietors and employers have looked with friendly eyes upon the supplies of comparatively cheap labor coming from abroad. This has been a potent factor in many of our political and economic policies. The early comers to America strove in every way to obtain a cheap labor force through immigration. Large numbers of immigrants or of their children have been able soon, in the conditions of the times, to become proprietors and employers. Thus was hastened the peopling of the wilderness. The interest of these classes harmonized to a certain point with the public interest; but likewise it was in some respects in conflict with the abiding welfare of the whole nation. It encouraged much defective immigration from Europe and led to the fateful introduction of slavery from Africa. A small planter class, heedless of the future, provided for its own ease, but it left to posterity a dark and bloody heritage which still remains the greatest threat to the American democratic experiment.

The immigration from Europe has furnished an ever changing group of workers moderating the rate of wages which employers otherwise would have had to pay. The continual influx of cheap labor has aided in imparting values to all industrial opportunities. A large part of these gains have been in the trade, manufactures, and real estate of cities as these have taken and retained an ever growing share of the immigrants. Successive waves of immigration, composed of different races, have been ready to fill the ranks of the unskilled workers at meager wages. This continuous inflow has in many industries come to be looked upon as an indispensable part of the labor supply. Conditions of trade, methods of manufacturing, prices, profits, and the capital value of the enterprises have become adjusted to the fact. Hence results one of those illusions cherished by the practical world when it identifies its own profits with the public welfare. Without immigration, it is said, the supply of labor would not be equal to the demand. It would not at the present wages. Supply and demand have reference to a certain price. At a higher wage the amount of labor offered and the amount demanded will come to an equality. This would temporarily curtail profits, and other prices would, after readjustment, be in a different ratio to wages. Such a prospect is most displeasing to the commercial world, quick to see disaster in a disturbance of profits, slow to see popular prosperity in rising wages.

Abnormal labor conditions.

The labor supply coming from countries of denser population and with low standards of living creates, in some occupations, an abnormally low level of wages and prices. Children can not be born in American homes and raised on the American standard of living cheaply enough to maintain at such low wages a continuous supply of laborers. Many industries and branches of industry in America are thus parasitical. A condition essentially pathological has come to be looked upon as normal. It is the commercial ideal which imposes itself upon the minds of men in other circles. The new immigration has recently been described by an author who combines wide knowledge of the facts with keen sympathy for the immigrant. He says:² "The past industrial development of America points unerringly to Europe as the source whence our unskilled labor supply is to be drawn. . . . America is in the race for the markets of the world; its call for workers will not cease." Yet a few pages further he must say: "All wage earners in America agree that it is not as easy to make a living today as it was twenty years ago, and the dollar does not go as far now as it did then. The conflict for subsistence on the part of the wage earner is growing more stern as we increase in numbers and industrial life becomes more complicated, and the fact must be faced that the vast army of workers must live more economically if peace and well being are to prevail." Here is our argument: increase in numbers is making the conflict for subsistence more stern. But how different the conclusion!

The opposition to restriction.

What tremendous forces are combined in favor of a policy of unrestricted immigration: sentiment and business, generosity, selfishness, laborers, employers. All men are prone to view immigration in its details, not in its entirety. They see this or that individual or class advantage, not the larger national welfare. The interests of capitalists and of the newly arriving immigrants are abundantly considered; the interests of the mass of the people now here are overlooked.

The depressing effect of the ever present and ever renewing supply of immigrant labor upon wages, appears most clearly at the time of wage contests, and often seems to be the most impor-

* Peter Roberts, in *The New Immigration*, 1912, preface, p. viii, and p. 47.

tant aspect of the question. The law against contract labor does not check the great stream of those guided by friends to a "job." If immigration were suddenly stopped in a period of normal or of increasing business, wages in many occupations would at once rise, and that, without the aid of strikes or arbitration. This would affect most those occupations which now present the most serious social problems, in mines, factories, and city sweat shops. In some small measure the war in the Balkan States, by recalling many men for service, has had this influence. Organized labor thinks most of these immediate effects. Commonly labor's protest is expressed in terms of the untenable "lump of labor" theory of wages. "Every foreign workman who comes to America" is believed to take "the place of some American workman." The error in this too rigid conception of the influence of new supplies of labor need not be argued before an audience of economists. But in the light of the doctrine of population there is no mistaking the influence of continually increasing numbers in gradually and permanently depressing the whole plane of wages. It is generally assumed that when the immigrants and their children become Americanized and raise their standard of living their presence no longer has any effect in depressing wages below what they otherwise would have been. Indeed it is tacitly assumed that the law of increasing returns operates as population becomes denser, and that the general prosperity is enhanced by the mere growth of numbers. This idea was measurably true so long as national growth was one of extension into unoccupied areas, and the average density of population was low. It ceases to be true whenever the ideal point of equilibrium between population and resources has been attained. The territorial distribution of immigrants, their training in the English language, and their adoption of American standards of living, can not change a mathematical fact.

Conditions of progress.

John Stuart Mill, in discussing the future of society when population might be expected to have ceased increasing, employed an already current term, the "stationary state." The phrase is hardly felicitous for, as he explained, this does not mean a society stationary in the industrial arts and in mental, moral, and social culture. Indeed it was just such a condition of a stationary population that he deemed the ultimate ideal when once that de-

gree of density had been attained which made possible the highest level of the general welfare. The theory of evolution as applied to social progress has suggested that a certain pressure of conflicting and thwarted desires is required to keep a people industrious, inventive, and progressive. The crude version of the theory implies the necessity of competition on the plane of physical want resulting from the pressure of population. A subtler conception would place this competition on the higher plane of developing desires made possible by industrial advance, political democracy, popular education, and a widening horizon of thought. A large part of our people have attained that stage now, and the cultural circle is ever widening. The spur of progress consists of the felt limitations of incomes, relative to expanding desires, rather than in the pangs of hunger. Once the spur of progress was objective, now it is subjective.

Popular aspirations and ideals.

In the last century popular education and ideals were rising at the same time that a rising scale of wages was made possible by industrial improvements accompanying the development of great material resources. Yet this fortunate union of events did not suffice to prevent the growth of discontent. Popular aspirations outstripped material progress. Much more ominous is the situation now that the pressure of population in America is beginning to check and reverse this trend of the popular welfare. Those who profit for a time by these shifts in the forces of distribution may find, like those who benefited by slavery, that they have bartered the peace and security of their children for the pleasures of a brief season.

The common man in our democracy has at stake the preservation of the advantages of our broad territory and bountiful resources. The only factor in the present increase of population that is controllable in large measure by legislative action is immigration. Many representatives of organized labor, though moved by more immediate considerations than those here presented, favor limitation. But the mass of the workers, diverted by false councils, traditional sentiments, and racial sympathies, are divided on the question. Without help from other groups of citizens the laborers of America can not obtain the needed legislation. Whether that help will be progressively granted in the years to come depends on the clearness of our economic judgments and on

the strength of our patriotic ideals. Perhaps those ideals are not clear to us. Would we have the level of the popular welfare in America fall even by a little if this could be prevented? Would we rival other lands rather in population than in prosperity? Would we wish to gain in density of settlement while losing in that largeness of opportunity and of outlook which makes possible the traits most distinctive of American life? Already we have on our map many cities swarming like ant hills, the delight of the real estate speculator and the despair of true friends of humanity. Shall it be our ideal to multiply men on city streets and in smoking suburbs, away from fields, and forests, and mountains; or shall we not rather give to all our people space to earn an ample living and to live an ample life, worthy of our democratic ideal?